

Examiner-Initiated Interview Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/500,670	CARRE, LAURENT	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Dennis H. Pedder	3612	

All Participants:

(1) Dennis H. Pedder.

(2) Mr. Seckel.

Status of Application: _____

(3) _____

(4) _____

Date of Interview: 26 July 2005

Time: afternoon

Type of Interview:

- ☒ Telephonic
☐ Video Conference
☐ Personal (Copy given to: ☐ Applicant ☐ Applicant's representative)

Exhibit Shown or Demonstrated: ☐ Yes ☐ No

If Yes, provide a brief description:

Part I.

Rejection(s) discussed:

35 USC 103

Claims discussed:

all

Prior art documents discussed:

references to Kitagawa and Kling v. Siedlecki of record.

Part II.

SUBSTANCE OF INTERVIEW DESCRIBING THE GENERAL NATURE OF WHAT WAS DISCUSSED:

Amend claim 1 to define the pin as "fixed" rather than movable as in Kitagawa and define the piercing of the lining to define over the reference to Kling. Delete claim 19 as correct only upon impact, not claimed in this claim..

Part III.

- ☐ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview directly resulted in the allowance of the application. The examiner will provide a written summary of the substance of the interview in the Notice of Allowability.
☐ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview did not result in resolution of all issues. A brief summary by the examiner appears in Part II above.

(Examiner/SPE Signature)

(Applicant/Applicant's Representative Signature – if appropriate)